UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,305	11/20/2003	Duoc Phuc Nguyen	MS#303476.01 (5087)	9760

38779   7590   07/23/2008
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/23/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 April 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14,17-38 and 40* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14,17-38 and 40* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the RCE and Amendment entered on

4/15/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 24, 26-31, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bantz et al. (US 2002/0120711), hereafter Bantz in view of

Grube et al. (US 2003/0100326), hereafter Grube in further view of Kariya (US

6169897).

Regarding **claims 1, 13, 24, and 27**, Bantz discloses:

A method of managing notifications in a web-based notifications system, said

notifications system being configured to provide notifications to a user via a data

communication network, said notifications containing content provided by one or more

content providers, said content relating to one or more topics, said method comprising:

implementing a web service responsive to requests structured according to an

extensible messaging framework; (Fig. 1, computer 100)

receiving, at the web service, a request from a content provider, said request

specifying a selected notification management function, said request being structured

according to the messaging framework; (See at least [0030], and [0037] which disclose

content providers (note that a node can be an event (i.e. content) generator and listener

at the same time))

extracting request information from the request, said request information including at least a content provider identifier and a topic identifier; and executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information. ([0037] inherently the subscription manager must determine who sent the subscription request, and what the subscription request is for, this must be extracted from the request data packet, or looked up based upon information extracted from the request data packet Additionally, [0037] includes the idea that more than one topic may be included in the request.)

Regarding **claims 3 and 26 as applied to claims 1 and 24**, Bantz discloses:

wherein the request includes a header and wherein extracting request information comprises extracting the content provider identifier from the header. (the sender identifier (i.e. IP/MAC address) is inherently included in every data packet sent on the network in the header. additionally, the recipient address is included within the header of the request [0037])

Regarding **claims 7, 28, and 40 as applied to claims 1, 24 and 37**, Bantz discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises performing a function corresponding to the topic identifier specified by the extracted request information selected from the group consisting of: creating a topic; deleting a topic; updating a topic; and enumerating topics. ([0037] discloses adding a subscription (i.e. topic) and deleting or updating a topic.)

Regarding **claims 8 and 29 as applied to claims 1 and 24**, Bantz discloses:

wherein extracting request information further comprises extracting a user identifier

to identify the user. ([0037] discloses extracting a recipient address)

Regarding **claims 9 and 30 as applied to claims 1, 8, 24 and 29**, Bantz

discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises

subscribing the identified user to a topic corresponding to the topic identifier

specified by the extracted request information, said identified user to receive at least

one notification via the web-based notifications system relating to the topic when

subscribed thereto. ([0037] discloses subscribing recipients to events, see [0035] for

an example of notifications being sent to subscribed recipients.)

Regarding **claims 11 and 31 as applied to claims 1, 8, 24, and 29**, Bantz

discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises

unsubscribing the identified user to a topic corresponding to the topic identifier

specified by the extracted request information, said identified user to no longer

receive notifications via the web-based notifications system relating to the topic

when unsubscribed thereto. ([0037] discloses cancelling, or unsubscribing recipients

from receiving notifications.)

Regarding **claim 12 as applied to claims 1 and 8**, Bantz discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises

updating one or more subscriptions based on the user identifier and the topic identifier

specified by the extracted request information. ([0037] discloses updating subscription information for users for various topics.)

Bantz discloses all the limitations of the claims except for an acknowledgement message being sent after a request for management activity.

The general concept of sending an acknowledgement to a request is well known in the art as taught by Grube. (See [0067])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bantz and the general concept of sending an acknowledgement to a request as taught by Grube in order to allow a user to retry if a request is not acknowledged.

Bantz and Grube teach all the limitations of the claims except for a url being associated with a topic identifier.

The general concept of associating a URL with a topic identifier is well known in the art as taught by Kariya. (see at least Col. 4 lines 28-42)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bantz and Grube with the general concept of associating a URL with a topic identifier as taught by Kariya in order to make the system easier to understand and operate.

4.   Claims 10, and 15-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantz, Grube, and Kariya as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (US 6763384), hereafter Gupta.

Regarding **claims 14, 23, and 32**, Bantz discloses:

The subject matter of these claims are substantially the same as that of claim 9, so are rejected for the same reasoning.

Regarding **claims 15 and 33 as applied to claims 14 and 32**, Bantz discloses:

wherein said request information extracted from the request further specifies a selected notification management function to be performed by the notifications system, and further comprising executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information. ([0037] discloses various management functions to be performed, which inherently must be defined within the request to the subscription manager.)

Regarding **claims 16 and 34 as applied to claims 14-15 and 32-33**, Bantz discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises subscribing the user to a topic corresponding to the topic identifier specified by the extracted request information, said user to receive at least one notification via the web-based notifications system relating to the topic when subscribed thereto. ([0037] discloses subscribing recipients to events, see [0035] for an example of notifications being sent to subscribed recipients.)

Regarding **claim 17 as applied to claims 14-15**, Bantz discloses:

wherein executing the selected notification management function comprises unsubscribing the user to a topic corresponding to the topic identifier specified by the extracted request information, said user to no longer receive notifications via the web-based notifications system relating to the topic when unsubscribed thereto.

Regarding **claim 18 as applied to claim 14**, Bantz discloses:

further comprising creating a response object in response to said received request,

said response object being structured according to the messaging framework, said

response object containing information relating to either success or failure of the

request. ([0037] discloses updating subscription information for users for various

topics.)

Regarding **claim 19 as applied to claims 14 and 18**, Grube teaches:

wherein said response object contains information identifying the created

subscription. ([0067] teaches sending an acknowledgement to a subscription request

over a data network.)

Regarding **claims 20 and 35 as applied to claims 14, 18, and 32**, Grube

teaches (as mentioned in the above rejection of claim 1):

further comprising sending the response object to the content provider via the data

communication network. ([0067] teaches sending an acknowledgement to a

subscription request over a data network.)

Regarding **claim 22 as applied to claim 14**, Bantz discloses:

wherein the request includes a header and wherein extracting request

information comprises extracting the content provider identifier from the header. ([0037]

discloses extracting a recipient address)

Bantz, Grube, and Kariya do not disclose the limitations of claim 10.

The general concept of having a user database containing routing information for

creating subscriptions is well known in the art as taught by Gupta. (See at least table 2.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Bantz, Grube, and Kariya with the general concept of having a user

database containing routing information for creating subscriptions as taught by Gupta in

order to allow the entity subscribing for requests to be ignorant of the user's actual

address and port requirements.

5.   Claims 2, 21, 25, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bantz, Grube, and Kariya as applied to claims 1, 14, 24, 32, and 37

above, and further in view of Horvitz et al (US 2003/0101190), hereafter Horvitz.

Bantz, Grube, and Kariya teach all the limitations of claims 2, 21, 25, 36, and 38

except for the use of the SOAP protocol and SOAP requests.

The general concept of using SOAP in a notification management environment is

well known in the art as taught by Horvitz. ([0041] teaches the use of SOAP)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Bantz, Grube, and Kariya with the general concept of using SOAP

in a notification management environment as taught by Horvitz in order to allow easier

communication behind proxies and firewalls.

6.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bantz,

Grube, and Kariya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Linderman (US

2002/0032790).

Bantz, Grube, and Kariya teach all of the limitations of claim 6 except for a command

line interface.

The general concept of providing a command line interface to issue commands is well known in the art as taught by Linderman. ([0042])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bantz, Grube, and Kariya with the general concept of providing a command line interface to issue commands as taught by Linderman in order to provide more flexible ways to interact with applications.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-38, and 40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8.   Further, Applicant argues that the cited references do not disclose or teach the limitation of "executing the selected notification management function based on the extracted request information for each of the plurality of topic identifiers". The Examiner disagrees, as in paragraph 37, it is disclosed in Bantz the receiving of a subscription request, and the actual subscribing taking place as a result of that request.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 7/17/2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2146